May 5, 2005

Mr. Spencer Reid General Counsel Office of the Lieutenant Governor of Texas Texas State Capitol Building Austin, Texas 78711-2068

OR2005-03898

Dear Mr. Reid:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 223594.

The Office of the Lieutenant Governor (the "lieutenant governor") received a request for all correspondence related to negotiations between the lieutenant governor and two named companies. You state that you have released some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim that the remainder of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104, 552.106, 552.111, and 552.131 of the Government Code.

You also state that release of some of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of Cabela's and International SEMATECH ("SEMATECH"). You inform us that you have notified these interested third parties of the lieutenant governor's receipt of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); see also Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). Cabela's has responded to the notice. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as

to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, SEMATECH has not submitted to this office its reasons explaining why the requested information relating to it in Exhibit C should not be released. Consequently, SEMATECH has provided this office with no basis to conclude that its responsive information is excepted from disclosure. See id. § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish prima facie case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Accordingly, we conclude that you may not withhold the document in Exhibit C which pertains to SEMATECH on the basis of its proprietary interests. Furthermore, as you have raised no exceptions to disclosure for this information, it must be released to the requestor.

Cabela's raises sections 552.110 with respect to its information in Exhibit C.¹ Section 552.110 protects: (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. See Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. See Gov't Code § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

¹Although Cabela's also raises section 552.101 for its proprietary information, section 552.110 is the proper exception to claim for this type of information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Therefore, we will address Cabela's arguments under section 552.110. Furthermore, while Cabela's has asserted all exceptions "contained in [s]ections 552.101 through 552.1425 of the Act," the company has provided arguments only for sections 552.110 and 552.131. We address only those exceptions Cabela's has argued.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex.); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 2 (1990), 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 319 (1982), 306 (1982), 255 (1980), 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a prima facie case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects "[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]" Gov't Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. Gov't Code § 552.110(b); see also National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

After carefully reviewing the arguments presented to us by Cabela's and the information at issue, we find that Cabela's has not adequately demonstrated that any portion of this information qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). However, we find that Cabela's has made a specific factual or evidentiary showing that the release of some of the

information it seeks to withhold would cause the company substantial competitive harm. This information, which we have marked, must be withheld pursuant to section 552.110(b).

Cabela's also raises section 552.131 of the Government Code. Section 552.131 relates to economic development information and provides in part:

- (a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:
 - (1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or
 - (2) commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained.
- (b) Unless and until an agreement is made with the business prospect, information about a financial or other incentive being offered to the business prospect by the governmental body or by another person is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Gov't Code § 552.131. Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure only "trade secret[s] of [a] business prospect" and "commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained." Id. This aspect of section 552.131 is co-extensive with section 552.110 of the Government Code. See Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b). Because Cabela's has not demonstrated that the remainder of its information qualifies as a trade secret for purposes of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code, nor made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required under section 552.110(b) that the release of the remainder of its information would result in substantial competitive harm, we also conclude that the lieutenant governor may not withhold any of the remaining information pursuant to section 552.131(a). Furthermore, we note that section 552.131(b) is designed to protect the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. As the lieutenant governor has not claimed an exception under section 552.131(b) for this information, none of Cabela's remaining information in Exhibit C is excepted under section 552.131 of the Government Code.

We now address the lieutenant governor's arguments for the remaining submitted information. Section 552.111 excepts from public disclosure "an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency." The purpose of this exception is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative

process. See Austin v. City of San Antonio, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990). In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5. A governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. Id.; see also City of Garland v. The Dallas Morning News, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. See Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5. If, however, the factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information may also be withheld under section 552.111. See Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You state that the submitted documents in Exhibit B "consist of internal communications of the Lieutenant Governor's staff or communications with the Governor's or Speaker's staff' regarding economic development under the Texas Enterprise Fund. You further state that the information you seek to withhold under section 552.111 consists of staff interpretations of issues related to "the potential of job creation, appropriate salary targets, and job retention in the requested grants." On the basis of your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that the information that you seek to withhold in Exhibit B, except as we have marked otherwise, is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code, and may be withheld from the requestor on that basis.²

You claim that the remaining information in Exhibit B is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104. Section 552.104 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). The purpose of section 552.104 is to protect a governmental body's interests in competitive bidding situations. See Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). Moreover, section 552.104 requires a showing of some actual or specific harm in a particular competitive situation; a general allegation that a competitor will gain an unfair advantage will not suffice. See Open Records Decision No. 541 at 4 (1990). Generally, section 552.104 does not except information relating to competitive bidding situations once a bid

²You also seek to withhold some of the information in Exhibit B under section 552.131. As you may withhold this information under section 552.111, we need not address this argument.

has been awarded and a contract has been executed. *See id.* Upon review, we conclude that the lieutenant governor may not withhold the remaining information in Exhibit B under section 552.104. As you raise not other exceptions to disclosure of this information, it must be released to the requestor.

Finally, you claim that the information submitted in Exhibit A is excepted from disclosure under section 552.106. Section 552.106 of the Government Code excepts from required public disclosure "[a] draft or working paper involved in the preparation of proposed legislation[.]" Gov't Code § 552.106(a). Section 552.106(a) ordinarily applies only to persons with a responsibility to prepare information and proposals for a legislative body. See Open Records Decision No. 460 at 1 (1987). The purpose of this exception is to encourage frank discussion on policy matters between the subordinates or advisors of a legislative body and the members of the legislative body; therefore, section 552.106 encompasses only policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals involved in the preparation of proposed legislation and does not except purely factual information from public disclosure. Id. at 2. However, a comparison or analysis of factual information prepared to support proposed legislation is within the ambit of section 552.106. Id. We have reviewed the document submitted as Exhibit A and conclude that the lieutenant governor may withhold this information pursuant to section 552.106(a).

We note that the submitted information contains information that is protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, we conclude you must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.110(b). The lieutenant governor may withhold the information in Exhibit B, excepted as we have marked otherwise, under section 552.111. You may withhold the information in Exhibit A under section 552.106. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor. The information that is protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with federal copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by

filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

Namura J. Harswick

Tamara L. Harswick Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

TLH/sdk

Ref: ID# 223594

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Dan Zehr
Business Reporter
Austin American-Statesman
305 South Congress
Austin, Texas 78704
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David A. Roehr Executive Vice President Cabela's 4800 NW 1st Street, Suite 300 Lincoln, Nebraska 68521 (w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert E. Falstad General Counsel and Secretary SEMATECH Law Department 2706 Montopolis Drive Austin, Texas 78741-6499 (w/o enclosures)